

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450-Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/676,058	10/01/2003	Kay Leong Lim	AMT00-002CB	7739	
7590 07/14/2006			EXAM	EXAMINER	
George O. Sail 28 Davis Avenu			MCNELIS, KA	MCNELIS, KATHLEEN A	
Poughkeepsie,	<del>-</del>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1742	•	
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/676,058	LIM ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kathleen A. McNelis	1742		

	Kathleen A. McNelis	1742					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complishing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of se appeal. Since				
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a  NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
		mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
		mpliant / inchament	(1 102 02 1).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	novable ii dabiiii.ca iii a deparate,	annon, mod annon	<b>3</b>				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13-24</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)					
13. 🗀 Oulet							

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No. 10/676,058

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The following amendments to the claims introduce new limitations that will require additional consideration and/or search:

- 1) In claima 15 and 16, "...said first and second parts being impossible to separate without damage thereto..."
  2) In claims 19 and 22 "... said handle and cutting edge being impossible to separate without damage thereto...".

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are based on amendments which were not present in the finally rejected claims.

Examiner acknowldeges IDS file date 4/17/2006, however this IDS has not been reviewed since new issues have been raised in the amended claims which will require additional consideration and/or search.

ROY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700